

Appendix E

Discussion of Analysis and Process

Size and Scope of Analysis

The IDT initially discussed two options: doing the roads analysis on the combined Medicine Bow-Routt National Forests, excluding the Thunder Basin National Grassland, or doing the roads analysis only on the Medicine Bow National Forest. The team developed a list of advantages and disadvantages in taking one approach over the other. In January 2001, the Forest Leadership Team decided to do only the Medicine Bow National Forest in 2001 then assemble teams to do the Routt National Forest and Thunder Basin National Grassland in 2002 to meet the required completion of forest-scale roads analyses for the combined forest by January 2003.

Briefly, the advantages of performing the combined Medicine Bow-Routt National Forests roads analysis (excluding the Thunder Basin NG) were:

- The issues across these units for a forest-scale roads analysis are probably similar.
- Performing both at the same time would save team members time over the long-term.
- There are several major roads that connect between the two forests so it would be logical to combine the forests for the analysis due to the road and land-base connection.

The rationale for performing just the Medicine Bow National Forest was as follows:

- The IDT initially felt that the Medicine Bow roads analysis might be completed by the end of May 2001, freeing all team members for the upcoming summer field season.
- Each of the combined forest are being managed under different forest plans, and this roads analysis is intended to compare the road systems to the direction in the forest plans. This approach would create a very complex analysis situation as the Medicine Bow National Forest is still operating under the 1985 Forest Plan, while the Routt National Forest is operating under a recently revised plan.
- Combining both forest units would likely entail up to one year for completion of the analysis. Given that timeframe, it was unlikely that this roads analysis could be used as an assessment in the Medicine Bow National Forest Plan revision effort.
- Many team members had other major workloads, such as the Routt Forest Plan reversal, the BFES budget system, and the revision of both the Medicine Bow National Forest Plan and Thunder Basin National Grassland Plan. The additional workload of combining the forests for the roads analysis could have compromised headway on all of these major projects.
- The IDT was unsure if the GIS systems for the two forests would be compatible for combining the forests in the roads analysis.

The IDT and the Forest Planning Staff Director reaffirmed the original FLT decision to do just the Medicine Bow National Forest roads analysis at this time and they developed the following additional scale and intensity items:

- The Medicine Bow NF is comprised of four main geographic divisions: Sierra Madre, Medicine Bow Range, Pole Mountain, and Laramie Peak. The road systems within these divisions have vastly different linkages with the county and state road systems. There are also different specific resource and social issues for these geographic divisions.
- The broad issues identified by the IDT for this roads analysis can be related to the whole Medicine Bow National Forest.
- Although the original analysis process criteria identified using a GIS-based approach, most of the county and state roads that link to the forest from the adjacent communities do not exist in the GIS database. Therefore, a descriptive approach would be necessary to assess these roads.

Develop a Process Plan, Schedule IDT Meetings, and Identify Additional Specialists Needed.

At the first IDT meeting, it became clear that some of the analysis process would need to be more clearly developed and refined over time: in particular, how to extract specific results from the available information. However, the team was confident that the watershed GIS assessment would provide the key resource risk information for the analysis.

Subsequent IDT meetings were held in early and late April (via conference call) and early and late May 2001. Most of the work during this period involved the GIS watershed assessment and compiling the draft road matrix information. During this time, it became clear that additional GIS support and expertise were needed to extract the watershed assessment information.

The IDT agreed that the final product would include a report, maps, and matrices by road, issues, values, and watershed condition, and that the criteria would be illustrated by high, medium, low values.

Personnel Time Needed:

In addition to identifying personnel needed for the Medicine Bow National Forest roads analysis, the IDT also drafted a budget plan. The budget included 6 days of IDT meetings and 3 days of Region 2 roads analysis project training.

Core ID Team				
Name	Cost/Day	Days	Per diem	Salary cost
Robin Brooks	\$217	49	\$3,000	\$10,633
Steve Coupal	\$217	14		\$3,794
Rob Schmitzer	\$239	18	\$250	\$4,302
Gary Roper	\$258	17	\$250	\$4,381
Mary Sanderson	\$252	17		\$4,284
Liz Schnackenberg	\$212	20	\$250	\$4,240
Tom Cartwright	\$297	16		\$4,455
Leslie Horsch	\$150	10	\$150	\$1,500
		Total	\$3,900	\$37,589

Extended ID Team				
Name	Cost/Day	Days	Per diem	Salary cost
Tom Florich	\$255	3		\$765
Bob Mountain	\$297	1		\$297
Greg Eglin	\$262	2		\$524
Tommy John	\$259	1		\$259
Carol Tolbert	\$235	5		\$1,175
Nick Benke	\$98	5		\$490
Sue Struthers	\$290	1		\$290
Pat Harrison	\$290	2		\$580
Dean Labeda	\$217	1		\$217
Tim Morowski	\$235	1		\$235
Jeff Tupula	\$266	1		\$266
Total				\$5,098

Total Salary Costs	\$42,687
Per Diem	\$3,900
Misc. Supplies	\$500
TOTAL	\$46,587

The IDT also estimated that doing the combined Medicine Bow and Routt National Forests roads analysis would cost approximately \$78,750 for FY 01 but that it was unlikely the work would be completed in FY 01.

General Discussion Points:

The IDT established basic rules for individual responsibilities such as everyone on the team is responsible for contributing to group discussion and for completing their specialist role in the analysis within the timelines agreed upon by the team. Assignments for responding to the Step 4 questions were made at the first IDT meeting.

Another key discussion point was the fact that this would be one of the first forest-scale roads analyses completed in the agency, and the IDT would have the responsibility of sharing the process with other forests, describing what did and didn't work, and presenting the findings to the Region and other forests.